

**GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM**  
**Instrument Procedures Group**  
**May 1, 2007**  
**HISTORY RECORD**

**FAA Control # 07-01-270**

**Subject:** **Course Change Limitation Notes on SIAPs**

**Background/Discussion:** For several years the NFPO has included procedural data notes at both feeder fixes and IAFs where course change in excess of 120 degrees could change arriving along an airway or pertinent approach segments. This is in accordance with the TERPs criteria contained in 8260.3B, Paragraphs 220b (feeders) and 232a.(1) (initial segments). Recently, AFS-420 advised the NFPO that 8260.19C policy permits such notes only at IAFs.

NBAA did an ad hoc search and found 40 SIAPs in the Western U.S. with the applicable note at feeder fixes. It is reasonable to extrapolate that some 200 SIAPs throughout the U.S. have such notes at a feeder fix.

The NFPO practice appears to be in accordance with the two above-mentioned TERPS criteria. The question becomes: should policy require charting such notes because the criteria have a design limitation for both feeder and initial approach segments? The statement in Paragraph 220b does not seem to be concerned with the airway case.

Nonetheless, the NFPO has promulgated a lot of charts with the note pertaining to airways. To change the practice now to chart only at IAFs will serve to further confuse the aviation community

**Recommendations:** NBAA believes one of two actions should be taken to provide consistency and resolve this issue:

1. Remove all such notes for both feeder fixes and IAFs, and advise the aviation community via the AIM of the issues involved with large course changes from airways to SIAPs.
2. Or, continue NFPO's practice of the past several years and amend policy accordingly to conform to practice.

If Option #1 is decided upon, all such notes should be removed by P-NOTAMS simultaneous so as to minimize having inconsistent charts in pilot manuals.

**Comments:** This recommendation affects policy set forth in 8260.19C, "Flight Procedures and Airspace".

**Submitted by:** Steve Bergner

**Phone:** 202-783-9000

**E-mail:** [Bergners@granitelp.com](mailto:Bergners@granitelp.com)

**Organization:** National Business Aviation Association

**FAX:** 202-331-8364

**Date:** April 5, 2007

**Initial Discussion Meeting 07-01:** New Issue presented by Rich Boll, NBAA, expressing concern over procedural data notes at both feeder fixes and IAFs where course changes in excess of 120 degrees could alter arrival procedures along an airway or pertinent approach segments. The NFPO has included these notes for years and they are in consonance with the TERPs criteria contained in paragraphs 220b (feeder routes) and 232a(1) (initial segments). Recently, AFS-420 advised the NFPO that Order 8260.19C policy permits such notes only at IAFs. NBAA questions whether policy should require charting such notes because the criteria have a design limitation for both feeder and initial approach segments? The statement in Paragraph 220b does not seem to be concerned with the airway case. Wally Roberts, NBAA, questioned why we have these notes at all. Perhaps a better methodology would be to eliminate the notes and update the AIM and IPH. Brad Rush, AJW-321, echoed Wally's sentiments and also recommended doing away with these notes. Tom Schneider, AFS-420, stated that turns in the en route environment from one en route fix to another are TERPS protected; therefore, perhaps turns from feeder routes to IAFs are also protected. He took the IOU to present the issue to the AFS-420 TERPS criteria writers for resolution. **ACTION: AFS-420.**

---

**MEETING 07-02:** Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed that this issue is still under discussion within AFS-420. Feeder fix protection is still under review and en route criterion is being assessed to see whether it covers the issue. **ACTION: AFS-420.**

---

**MEETING 08-01:** Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed the following input as received from Jack Corman, the AFS-420 lead criteria specialist: "Current TERPS criteria has supported the conventional airway/feeder route connections in the past and Notes are not currently "required". This may change when reviewed for a future TERPS change. In the current work plans, this is low priority and the issue will be addressed through the USIFPP. AFS-420 will monitor progress through the USIFPP. **ACTION: AFS-420.**

---

**MEETING 08-02:** Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed that after the last meeting, he forwarded the issue to the USIFPP. The following update from Jack Corman, Executive Director of the US-IFPP, is provided: "The US-IFPP is currently working on TERPS Change 21, FAA Order 8260.52A, and AC 90-RNP. Current staffing levels and national program initiatives that are afforded priorities will probably place changes to TERPS Chapters 15 & 17 in the 2009/2010 time frame." AFS-420 will continue to monitor progress through the USIFPP. **ACTION: AFS-420.**

---

**MEETING 09-01:** Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed that he forwarded the issue to the US-IFPP Chair on August 22, 2008. As stated at meeting 08-02, changes to TERPS Volume 1, Chapters 15 & 17, will not occur until at least the 2010 time frame and possibly later. Jack Corman, AFS-420, Executive Director of the US-IFPP stated that workload and staffing levels prevent more timely accommodation of this request and suggested tabling this agenda item until late 2010. AFS-420 will address the issue when workload and resources permit. **ACTION: AFS-420.**

---

**MEETING 09-02:** Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed that there is no change in status for this issue. As noted at previous meetings, Jack Corman, AFS-420, Executive Director of the US-IFPP stated that due to workload and staffing levels, changes to TERPS Volume 1 Chapters 15 and 17 will not occur until at least the 2010 time frame. **ACTION: AFS-420.**

---

**MEETING 10-01:** Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed the following update as received from Jack Corman, AFS-420 and Executive Director of the US-IFPP: "Initial studies indicate that turns should be limited to an absolute maximum of 120 degrees, with a recommended maximum of 90 degrees. That said, it appears that simply adding a turn limitation may not be sufficient to address the entire problem. Inside turn protection may also need to be expanded. If that is the case, a notice may be necessary as an interim measure before the TERPS document can be updated. This is #2 or #3 in priority in the queue of changes behind current work in progress." **ACTION: AFS-420 (US-IFPP).**

---

**MEETING 10-02:** Tom Schneider, AFS-420, presented the following update from T.J. Nichols, AFS-420 conventional TERPS criteria specialist: "No immediate action is planned. Expect course change limitations to be addressed in an early change to Order 8260.3 "C" revision." **ACTION: AFS-420 (US-IFPP)**

---

**MEETING 11-01:** Tom Schneider, AFS-420, presented the following update from T.J. Nichols, the AFS-420 conventional TERPS criteria specialist: The issue has been discussed at the US-IFPP and draft Order 8260.3C includes the following text: "The angle of intersection between a feeder route course and the enroute structure must not exceed 120 degrees. The angle of intersection between a feeder route course and the next segment (feeder/initial) course must not exceed 120 degrees except when connecting to a course reversal segment." A US-IFPP working group for 8260.3C will be convened in May/June 2011 to begin the directive change process. Brad Rush, AJV-3B, pointed out that the criteria for RNAV procedures is 90 degrees. Tom stated the criteria is not final and is still open through the US-IFPP. **ACTION: AFS-420 (US-IFPP)**

---